

REMARKS

1. Present Status of Patent Application

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding non-final Office Action mailed November 23, 2007. Claims 1-2, 7-10, and 14-20 have been amended in the present response. Claims 1-20 remain pending in the present application. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

2. Summary of Substance of Telephone Interview

Applicants wish to express their sincere appreciation for the time that Examiner Greene spent with Applicants' Attorney, Mr. Charles W. Griggers, during a telephone discussion on February 13, 2008 regarding the outstanding Office Action. During the discussion, proposed arguments were discussed regarding the outstanding rejection (which are contained herein in a revised format). In particular, the Examiner advised that the proposed amendments should be structured as positive recitations instead of negative recitations. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully requests the Examiner to consider the present response and the amendments contained therein.

3. Response to Objections of Claims

Claims 2, 10, 15, and 17 have been objected to because of an alleged lack of antecedent basis. The claims have been amended and are believed to address the Examiner's concerns. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

4. Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 6, 7, 14, and 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by *Zellner* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0149437 A1).

a. Claim 1

As provided in independent claim 1, Applicant claims:

A system for monitoring guests in a network community, comprising:

an account database maintaining a plurality of resident accounts for a plurality of resident users of the network community and at least one guest account of at least one guest of a respective resident user, wherein a user of the at least one guest account maintains administrative control over the at least one guest account; and

an account server accessing the at least one guest account to determine a status of the at least one guest account and updating a respective resident account with the status of the at least one guest account, wherein:

the respective resident account contains guest account information for the at least one guest sponsored by the respective resident user, the guest account information being added to the respective resident account upon creation of the at least one guest account; and

the account server updates the status of the at least one guest account sponsored by the respective resident user in the respective resident account.

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 is allowable for at least the reason that *Zellner* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least “an account server accessing the at least one guest account to determine a status of the at least one guest account and updating a respective resident account with the status of the at least one guest account, wherein: the respective resident account contains guest account information for the at least one guest sponsored by the respective resident user, the guest account information being added to the respective resident account upon creation of the at least one guest account,” as emphasized above.

For example, *Zellner* describes a process for a primary account holder to place limits on what types of transactions can be executed by a secondary user of the account. Accordingly, in *Zellner*, the primary account holder maintains administrative control of a second user, whereas the claimed subject matter recites “wherein a user of the at least one guest account maintains administrative control over the at least one guest account.” For at least this reason, *Zellner* fails to teach or suggest at least “an

account server accessing the at least one guest account to determine a status of the at least one guest account and updating a respective resident account with the status of the at least one guest account, wherein: the respective resident account contains guest account information for the at least one guest sponsored by the respective resident user, the guest account information being added to the respective resident account upon creation of the at least one guest account,” as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, claim 1 is not anticipated by *Zellner*, and the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

b. Claims 6 and 7

For at least the reasons given above, claim 1 is allowable over the cited art of record. Since claims 6 and 7 depend from claim 1, claims 6 and 7 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record.

c. Claim 14

As provided in independent claim 14, Applicant claims:

A method for monitoring guest users of a network community, comprising:

maintaining a plurality of resident accounts for a plurality of resident users of the network community and at least one guest account of at least one guest of a respective resident user, wherein a user of the at least one guest account maintains administrative control over the at least one guest account;

accessing the at least one guest account to determine a status of the at least one guest account; and

updating a respective resident account with the status of the at least one guest account.

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 14 is allowable for at least the reason that *Zellner* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least “maintaining a plurality of resident accounts for a plurality of resident users of the network community and at least one guest account of at least one guest of a respective resident user, wherein a user of the at least one guest account maintains administrative control over the at least one guest account,” as emphasized above.

For example, *Zellner* describes a process for a primary account holder to place limits on what types of transactions can be executed by a secondary user of the account. Accordingly, in *Zellner*, the primary account holder maintains administrative control of a second user, whereas the claimed subject matter recites “wherein a user of the at least one guest account maintains administrative control over the at least one guest account.” For at least this reason, *Zellner* fails to teach or suggest at least “maintaining a plurality of resident accounts for a plurality of resident users of the network community and at least one guest account of at least one guest of a respective resident user, wherein a user of the at least one guest account maintains administrative control over the at least one guest account,” as recited in claim 14.

Therefore, claim 14 is not anticipated by *Zellner*, and the rejection of claim 14 should be withdrawn.

d. Claim 18

For at least the reasons given above, claim 14 is allowable over the cited art of record. Since claim 18 depends from claim 14, claim 18 is allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record.

5. Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 8-9, 16-17, and 19-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Zellner* in view of *Szeto* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0140103 A1). Claims 2-3 and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Zellner* in view of *Keohane* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0216842 A1). Claims 4-5 and 10-13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Zellner* in view of *Keohane* in further view of *Szeto*.

a. Claims 2-5 and 8-9

For at least the reasons given above, claim 1 is allowable over the cited art of record. Claims 2-5 and 8-9 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record, since *Keohane* and *Szeto* fail to remedy the deficiencies of the cited art and claims 2-5 and 8-9 depend from claim 1.

For example, *Szeto* describes that a guest user can utilize an instant messaging service as long as a registered user is connected or logged onto the service. Therefore, the registered user maintains administrative control over the guest user in *Szeto*. *Keohane* describes a method of managing event schedules including determination of probable attendance to a scheduled event. See para. 0008. As such, *Szeto* and *Keohane* do not remedy the deficiencies of the cited reference.

b. Claim 10

As provided in independent claim 10, Applicant claims:

A system for monitoring guest users of a network community, comprising:

means for storing a plurality of resident accounts for a plurality of resident users of the network community and at least one guest account of at least one guest of a respective resident user, wherein a user of the at least one guest account maintains administrative control over the at least one guest account;

means for accessing the at least one guest account to determine a status of the at least one guest account;

means for updating a respective resident account with the status of the at least one guest account;

means for generating the at least one guest account; and

means for adding account information concerning the at least one guest account to the respective resident account upon the generation of the at least one guest account, wherein the account information includes a date upon which a guest invitation was sent to a respective guest and an end-date upon which the at least one guest account is scheduled to end.

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 10 is allowable for at least the reason that *Zellner* in view of *Keohane* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least “means for storing a plurality of resident accounts for a plurality of resident users of the network community and at least one guest account of at least one guest of a respective

resident user, wherein a user of the at least one guest account maintains administrative control over the at least one guest account” and “means for adding account information concerning the at least one guest account to the respective resident account upon the generation of the at least one guest account, wherein the account information includes a date upon which a guest invitation was sent to a respective guest and an end-date upon which the at least one guest account is scheduled to end,” as emphasized above.

For example, *Zellner* describes a process for a primary account holder to place limits on what types of transactions can be executed by a secondary user of the account. Accordingly, in *Zellner*, the primary account holder maintains administrative control of a second user, whereas the claimed subject matter recites “wherein a user of the at least one guest account maintains administrative control over the at least one guest account.” For at least this reason, *Zellner* fails to teach or suggest at least “means for storing a plurality of resident accounts for a plurality of resident users of the network community and at least one guest account of at least one guest of a respective resident user, wherein a user of the at least one guest account maintains administrative control over the at least one guest account” and “means for adding account information concerning the at least one guest account to the respective resident account upon the generation of the at least one guest account, wherein the account information includes a date upon which a guest invitation was sent to a respective guest and an end-date upon which the at least one guest account is scheduled to end,” as recited in claim 10.

Keohane describes a method of managing event schedules including determination of probable attendance to a scheduled event. See para. 0008. As such, *Keohane* individually or in combination with *Zellner* fails to teach or suggest “means for storing a plurality of resident accounts for a plurality of resident users of the network community and at least one guest account of at least one guest of a respective resident user, wherein a user of the at least one guest account maintains administrative control over the at least one guest account” and “means for adding account information concerning the at least one guest account to the respective resident account upon the generation of the at least one guest account, wherein the account information includes a date upon which a guest invitation was sent to a respective guest and an end-date upon which the at least one guest account is scheduled to end,” as recited in claim 10.

Therefore, claim 10 is patentable over *Zellner* in view of *Keohane*, and the rejection of claim 10 should be withdrawn.

c. Claims 11-13

For at least the reasons given above, claim 10 is allowable over the cited art of record. Since claims 11-13 depend from claim 10, claims 11-13 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record.

d. Claims 15-20

For at least the reasons given above, claim 14 is allowable over the cited art of record. Claims 15-20 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record, since *Keohane* and *Szeto* fail to remedy the deficiencies of the cited art and claims 15-20 depend from claim 14.

For example, *Szeto* describes that a guest user can utilize an instant messaging service as long as a registered user is connected or logged onto the service. Therefore, the registered user maintains administrative control over the guest user in *Szeto*. *Keohane* describes a method of managing event schedules including determination of probable attendance to a scheduled event. See para. 0008. As such, *Szeto* and *Keohane* do not remedy the deficiencies of the cited reference.

CONCLUSION

Any other statements in the Office Action that are not explicitly addressed herein are not intended to be admitted. In addition, any and all findings of inherency are traversed as not having been shown to be necessarily present. Furthermore, any and all findings of well-known art and official notice, or statements interpreted similarly, should not be considered well known for at least the specific and particular reason that the Office Action does not include specific factual findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support such conclusions.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. In addition, Applicant reserves the right to address any comments made in the Office Action that were not specifically addressed herein. Thus, such comments should not be deemed admitted by the Applicant. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned agent at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,



Charles W. Griggers, Reg. No. 47,283

**THOMAS, KAYDEN,
HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.**
Suite 1500
600 Galleria Parkway N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30339
(770) 933-9500